UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2623rd MEETING: 17 OCTOBER 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2623)	1
The question of South Africa:	
Statement by the President	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/17557)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2623rd MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 17 October 1985, at 11.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Vernon A. WALTERS
(United States of America).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2623)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in the Middle East:
   Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/17557)

The meeting was called to order at 12.10 p.m.

The question of South Africa:
Statement by the President

1. The PRESIDENT: At the outset of this meeting I wish to make the following statement on behalf of the members of the Security Council:

"The members of the Security Council have learned with indignation and the gravest concern of the South African authorities' intention to implement the death sentence imposed on Malesela Benjamin Moloise, in spite of the Council's appeals in this regard.

"The members of the Council once again draw the attention of the South African authorities to the Council President's statement of 20 August 1985 [*S/17408*] and Council resolution 547 (1984), which, *inter alia*, called upon the South African authorities not to carry out the execution of Mr. Moloise.

"The members of the Council are convinced that the carrying out of the execution will only result in a further worsening of an extremely grave situation.

"Once again, the members of the Council strongly urge the South African Government to extend clemency to Mr. Moloise and to rescind his death sentence."

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/17557)

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Lebanon in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. El-Turk (Lebanon) took a place at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) for the period from 12 April to 10 October 1985 [*S/17557*]. Members of the Council also have before them document S/17526, which contains the text of a letter dated 3 October 1985 from the representative of Lebanon to the Secretary-General, and S/17567, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.

4. It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall now put it to the vote.

A vote was taken by a show of hands.

In favour: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against: None

Abstaining: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

The draft resolution was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 2 abstentions [resolution 575 (1985)].

5. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

6. Mr. LIANG Yufan (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation consistently holds that the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon must be respected. Proceeding from this basic stand, and in view of the request from the Lebanese Government, China voted in favour of the resolution which the Council has just adopted, by which the Council authorizes the extension of the mandate of UNIFIL for another six months. We hope that in the next six months a fundamental improvement can be achieved in the situation of UNIFIL, which has been unable to perform its duties.

7. The Council assigned a clear mandate to UNIFIL in its resolution 425 (1978), namely, to confirm the withdrawal of Israeli forces, restore international peace and security and assist the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area. Regrettably, however, that mandate has so far not been truly carried out, despite the lapse of seven years. We must point out emphatically that such a state of affairs is far from normal and needs to be changed promptly.

8. We maintain that the Israeli authorities should be held responsible for this abnormal situation. By its massive invasion of Lebanon in 1982, Israel defied the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and completely ignored UNIFIL, bringing serious damage to the credibility of both the Interim Force and the United Nations. The so-called security zone set up by Israel in southern Lebanon constitutes the basic obstacle to the functioning of UNIFIL. Therefore the elimination of the aftermath of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, including the dismantling of the security zone and the total withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanese territory, is a prerequisite for the normal functioning of UNIFIL, the recovery of Lebanese sovereignty over southern Lebanon and the restoration of international peace and security in the area. The Council should take effective measures to attain these objectives.

9. The Chinese delegation fully shares the view expressed by the Secretary-General in paragraph 37 of his report, that a decision by the Council on the extension of the mandate must not be understood to mean that UNIFIL will be allowed to become an open-ended commitment for the troop-contributing countries and for the United Nations.

10. In conclusion, the Chinese delegation wishes to take this opportunity to express its sincere thanks to the troop-contributing countries and the officers and men of UNIFIL.

11. Mr. de KÉMOULARIA (France) (*interpretation from French*): France has just expressed through its vote its support for the extension of the mandate of UNIFIL and thus for the activities and role of the Force. It has thus responded to the request made by the Lebanese Government in this regard. My Government considers that despite the many obstacles that it has encountered, UNIFIL's action has been positive, in particular because it assures an international presence that is indispensable in a particularly sensitive region.

12. In this connection, my delegation is in agreement with the analysis of the situation submitted by the Secretary-General in his report. The situation prevailing in Lebanon south of the Litani is dangerous, and the events that took place yesterday provide new testimony to that. UNIFIL is caught between two hostile forces and continues to be prevented, in contravention of Council resolutions, from deploying its personnel up to the international border, as provided for in its mandate. France again insists on the need for comprehensive application as soon as possible of Council resolution 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) through negotiations with the parties concerned.

13. Furthermore, we believe that, as is stressed in the report, the extension of the mandate, however justified it may be at present, should not be construed as an open-ended commitment by the contributing countries to maintain UNIFIL, and consequently to provide it with the necessary contingents, indefinitely.

14. I share the concern expressed by the Secretary-General at the sizeable financial deficit that has accumulated so far and which is being borne by those States participating in the United Nations operation. It is therefore advisable that all members of the international community pay their contributions without delay and fulfil their responsibilities.

15. As members of the Council are aware, my country has spared no effort to ensure that it is represented by a significant contingent in the Force. France will therefore maintain its participation at the same level in terms of troops.

16. We also wish to reiterate our interest in the humanitarian and security aspects of the action that UNIFIL carries out in the spirit of resolution 523 (1982). It is very largely thanks to its presence that southern Lebanon is enjoying a little peace and security.

17. My delegation also wishes to express its concern at the continuous attacks that UNIFIL has to face and at the prospect of renewed violence in that part of Lebanon.

18. I would also inform the members of the Council that my country and the French public in general are concerned about the situation of tens of thousands of Christian Lebanese besieged in the city of Jazzin. We know that our concern is shared by many countries. I therefore wish to reaffirm today that my country remains ready, if circumstances so demand, and in liaison with the Lebanese Government, to consider action by UNIFIL to ensure the protection of Jazzin.

19. I conclude by associating myself with the Secretary-General in the hope so wisely expressed in the conclusions to his report, namely, that there is still a good chance of re-establishing peace in Lebanon, a country that has suffered for so long and with which my country has so many ties.

20. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Security

Council has been convened today to extend once again the mandate of UNIFIL. It is worth recalling that this is the 18th extension of the mandate of that Force since it was set up in March 1978.

21. In paragraph 4 of the last resolution on this item, resolution 561 (1985), the Council reiterates that "the Force should fully implement its mandate as defined in resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978) and all other relevant resolutions". Today, half a year later, we see that that resolution, like many other Council decisions on Lebanon—primarily the basic resolutions 425 (1978), 508 (1982) and 509 (1982)—has not been fulfilled, and the Force continues to be prevented from fulfilling the mandate conferred on it by the Council.

22. What has changed in the situation in southern Lebanon over the past six months? The answer to that question is clear from the report of the Secretary-General that is now before the Council. When Israel redeployed its troops, it handed over the border regions of southern Lebanon it claimed to be a "security zone" to the control of its mercenaries, the so-called South Lebanon Army, after having co-opted to that force its own military personnel in the guise of instructors and advisers. Of course, no one can have the slightest doubt that the Lahad gangs are about as independent in their actions as are puppets in a puppet theatre, and I do not think even the representative of Israel would contest that.

23. However, things have not stopped there. Israel has also left its own military units in the border zones, some in the area where the troops of UNIFIL are deployed. According to *The Washington Post* of 1 October, Israeli tank and mechanized units are stationed to the north of the Norwegian UNIFIL contingent as well as in the area under the responsibility of the Finnish UNIFIL batallions. As a result, as the Secretary-General notes in his report, the Force is hemmed in among the many positions occupied by the Israeli Army and its mercenaries and is being systematically subjected to armed attacks and bombardment.

24. The criminal practice of punitive operations continues, as does collective punishment directed against the civilian population of southern Lebanon. Israel's continuing occupation of part of Lebanese territory has quite naturally given rise to legitimate resistance by the Lebanese, who have been waging a valiant struggle to expel the aggressor from their land once and for all. Thus we cannot help but agree with the Secretary-General's conclusion in paragraph 33 of his report that "the current situation in Lebanon south of the Litani is not only unsatisfactory but also dangerous."

25. This situation cannot fail to give rise to the most serious concern. For more than seven and a half years, Israel has continued, either directly or through its mercenaries, to hold sway in Lebanon, defiantly refusing to implement the many resolutions of the Council that have clearly called for a complete and unconditional withdrawal of its troops from Lebanon. It is well known who stands behind Israel and who prevents the Council from calling the aggressor to book and ensuring fulfilment of its decisions, including those relating to the implementation of the UNIFIL mandate. The United States would do well to bear in mind the fact that such action seriously undermines the Council's prestige and effectiveness.

26. The Soviet Union decisively condemns Israel's continuing occupation of Lebanese territory and expresses its solidarity with the struggle of the Lebanese people to bring about the definitive expulsion of the aggressors from its ancestral lands.

27. It is important to guarantee fulfilment of the decisions taken by the Security Council and to see to it that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon are respected and that an end finally be put to the tyranny being practised against the civilian population.

28. The withdrawal of Israeli troops to the Israeli side of the border and the cessation of Israel's interference in the affairs of Lebanon would create conditions in which UNIFIL would be able freely to carry out the mandate entrusted it. With this in mind, and taking into consideration the request of the Lebanese Government and the recommendations of the Secretary-General, the Soviet delegation did not object to the extension of the mandate of UNIFIL for a further interim period. We abstained in the voting for reasons that we have set forth in detail at prior Council meetings.

29. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): There is no need for me to speak at length in explanation of my delegation's positive vote. My delegation's views are well known, as a result of our statements on previous similar occasions.

30. It remains our belief that the Council's objectives must be to secure a speedy and complete withdrawal of all Israeli forces, to establish peace and security in the area and to restore effective Lebanese authority and sovereignty up to the internationally recognized border. We accept the Secretary-General's view that the balance of advantage lies in renewing the mandate of UNIFIL for a further six months. At the same time we agree with him that continuation of the present situation in southern Lebanon is both unsatisfactory and dangerous.

31. It would be a mistake to believe that no harm is being done by Israel's policy of maintaining a so-called security zone on Lebanese soil and preventing UNIFIL from carrying out its mandate. On the contrary, real damage is being done to the chances of restoring stable and peaceful conditions in southern Lebanon. Opportunities are wasted, goodwill squandered and violent extremism encouraged. We appeal to those involved to face this realistically.

32. We take note with approval of the Secretary-General's observation that extension of the mandate of UNIFIL cannot be allowed to become an open-ended commitment for the troop-contributing countries and for the United Nations if the requisite conditions for the effective operation of the Force continue to be absent.

33. The Council cannot ignore the important effect that UNIFIL has already had on a dangerous situation, a situation which could cause a new threat to international peace and security, nor can the Council be indifferent to the trust of the local population, whose safety and well-being depend in large measure on the continuing efforts of the United Nations, and on UNIFIL in particular. This is why my Government once again joins the Secretary-General in appealing strongly to all Member States to pay their assessments to the UNIFIL Special Account, now in deficit to the tune of $US 224 million. This is an expense which is much more important and for a more important cause than many other projects to which the delegations at present in default contribute money.

34. We are most grateful to the Secretary-General and his staff for his report and for his continuing efforts. In addition, we extend our thanks and congratulations to the troop-contributing countries. This leads me, finally, to join others in paying a sincere tribute to Lieutenant-General Callaghan and all the personnel of UNIFIL and the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization for their courageous and devoted work and, in particular, their humanitarian efforts in most difficult circumstances.

35. Mr. ULRICH (Denmark): My delegation has closely studied the latest report of the Secretary-General on UNIFIL. We are deeply concerned about the situation in Lebanon south of the Litani as assessed by the Secretary-General.

36. The so-called security zone arrangement maintained north of the Israeli-Lebanese border is contrary to Security Council resolutions and has meant that UNIFIL finds itself in the midst of mutually hostile forces and is precluded from deploying right up to the international border in accordance with its mandate.

37. We have taken note of the Secretary-General's prediction that if the Israeli presence in the "security zone" continues for long, violence will inevitably escalate and spread, making UNIFIL's situation even more difficult.

38. Denmark therefore joins the Secretary-General in hoping that the Israeli authorities will conclude that, of all the options available, the effective implementation of UNIFIL's mandate would in the long run be the least hazardous for all concerned.

39. My Government once again urges that UNIFIL should be allowed to carry out the mandate laid down for it by the Security Council, namely, to assist the Lebanese Government in controlling the Lebanese border area and to provide security for both sides of that border.

40. My delegation should like to pay tribute to Lieutenant-General Callaghan, his staff and the officers and men of UNIFIL for the exemplary dedication and courage with which they have carried out their difficult tasks.

41. I should also like to express our sincere appreciation to the Secretary-General and his colleagues for their untiring efforts. The Secretary-General can count on my Government's full support in his continuing efforts to establish a firm basis for international peace and security in the area.

42. Everyone should seriously note his belief that there is still a good chance of re-establishing international peace and security in Lebanon south of the Litani if the correct actions are taken soon by all concerned, but that further undue delay is likely to produce a new and serious crisis, possibly with widespread ramifications.

43. The PRESIDENT: I shall now speak in my capacity as representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

44. Since my country was referred to, I believe it might be well that those who wish to tell others how to support Council decisions should at least pay their share of the cost of supporting UNIFIL.

45. I now resume my functions as PRESIDENT of the Council.

46. I call on the representative of Lebanon.

47. Mr. EL-TURK (Lebanon) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like to begin, Sir, by congratulating you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I should also like to express our complete confidence in your skill, experience and wisdom in directing the work of the Council in the right direction. Furthermore, I wish to express to your predecessor, Sir John Thomson, the representative of the United Kingdom, our appreciation for the constructive role he played in presiding over the work of the Council in September.

48. Following the vote on the draft resolution on extending the mandate of UNIFIL for a further six months, I must convey the thanks and appreciation of the delegation of Lebanon to the Council for acceding to the request of the Lebanese Government. I must furthermore pay tribute to the Secretary-General and his assistants for the excellent efforts they have made, which have been described in detail in his report.

49. I feel duty bound on this occasion to commend the work done by the Force, in conditions which are often difficult and sometimes dangerous because of the numerous obstacles created and acts of harassment carried out by the Israeli forces as well as by the illegitimate forces collaborating with them. We express Lebanon's gratitude and appreciation to UNIFIL, its leaders, soldiers and administrators. We would also express our appreciation to the States contributing to UNIFIL because they made possible the implementation of the wishes of the international community represented in the Council, and thus provided a shining example of what States can undertake within the appropriate framework to translate expressions of international solidarity into practice.

50. On this occasion, I must recall the Lebanese position, which is based on firm principles and foundations and has been expounded by Lebanon on many previous occasions in the Council. That position is in general based on the following:

—First, full implementation of resolution 425 (1978), which, in the light of the Lebanese request, included provision for the establishment of an international interim force for Southern Lebanon to ensure the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon, the restoration of international peace and security and assistance to the Government of Lebanon in restoring its effective authority in the area.

—Secondly, in conformity with that resolution, Israel must withdraw completely from Lebanese territories so as to allow the Force to carry out the task entrusted to it under resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978). Lebanon rejects the presence of any armed Israeli forces, regardless of the number and equipment of this presence and regardless whether it is overt or veiled.

—Thirdly, we reject the presence of any illegitimate collaborationist forces linked with Israel, and especially the so-called South Lebanon Army.

—Fourthly, we reject the principle of an Israeli security zone inside Lebanese territory.

—Fifthly, we reject all violation of the sanctity of Lebanese territories, air space and territorial waters.

—Sixthly, we condemn all forms of Israeli practices and inhuman acts in southern Lebanon.

51. The Lebanese delegation, while hoping that efforts made during the renewed mandate of UNIFIL will bear fruit and induce Israel to implement Council resolutions by withdrawing completely from Lebanese territories, at the same time welcomes any other initiatives that might produce the desired result. The Lebanese delegation appeals for support of the efforts of the Secretary-General and his assistants aimed at achieving this end.

52. Pending this outcome, we believe that the Force is carrying out its task in southern Lebanon with great courage and effectiveness. We believe that the presence of the Interim Force, despite the problems and difficulties it faces from time to time, is an important expression of the Security Council's commitment to assisting Lebanon to cope with continuing violations of the sanctity of its sovereignty and helping the Lebanese Government to restore its authority over all its territory within internationally recognized borders.

53. In addition, we appreciate the efforts made by UNIFIL to provide protection and humanitarian assistance for the local inhabitants in the areas where it is deployed. At the same time, we believe that the absence of international forces or the failure of those forces fully to carry out their mission will lead to further acts of violence and to increased tension in southern Lebanon as well as to instability in the region. Moreover, it would also demonstrate a weakening of international will and would be a victory for the principle of force; it would be a public admission by the Council of its inability to shoulder the international tasks entrusted to it.

54. Lebanon continues to believe that the Council is capable of assuming its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. We continue to believe that the Council desires the implementation of the resolutions it adopts, because of its firm belief in the rightfulness of the claim by any State to the safeguarding of its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity.

55. More than 10 years have passed since the outbreak of the Lebanese tragedy and the attendant suffering of the Lebanese people. The time has come for our nation, which has participated in the march of history for thousands of years and which was the birthplace of many civilizations, for a people like the peace-loving Lebanese people to be spared further bloodshed, tears and spiraling violence and destruction. The time has come for them to regain their sovereignty and territorial integrity. The time has come for the Lebanese people to resume a normal life and to take up again its creative endeavours.

56. Let us hope that the next time the Council meets to consider this item, it will be witness to the realization of those hopes.

57. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of Israel in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

It was so decided.

58. The PRESIDENT: I invite the representative of Israel to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

59. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): My participation in this discussion is prompted by two sets of remarks. The first was from the Soviet representative, and I shall deal with that quickly and then proceed to the second point.

60. The Soviet representative spoke about the ills of occupation and the ills of puppet régimes. He is right to speak about this; he could start directing those words to his own Government for its actions in Afghanistan, which are known to everybody here. But since he wants to address them to the Middle East, and specifically since he wants to address them to Lebanon, he has a ready address of occupation and of puppet régimes, and members of the Council know where that address lies—and it is not Israel.

We have absolutely no interest, no claim, no desire whatsoever regarding the question of territorial claims on Lebanon, or any other desires regarding Lebanon.

61. Lebanon, frankly, is not our interest. Our interest is one: security; security for people in the north of Israel, to prevent them from suffering the kind of calamities and attacks they have experienced over the last decade—actually, since the early 1970s, with the collapse of Lebanon's effective sovereignty and its domination first by the PLO (Palestine Liberation Organization) and then by Syria.

62. The problem of preventing cross-border attacks is the true domain of this discussion, because, in fact, that is the purpose of UNIFIL. The purpose of UNIFIL is not, as members know, to deal with the question of domestic tranquillity inside Lebanon or the terrible tragedies that have beset that country and still beset it every day. The purpose of UNIFIL is to ensure that there is no cross-border violence, that there is no continuous problem that involves international—and I stress the word "international"—peace and security.

63. I move on now to the second issue, and that is the question of international security. In the Council six months ago I heard the same predictions and prognoses as today: that the problem would deteriorate, that we would find ourselves in a difficult situation as far as the border between Israel and Lebanon and attacks on Israel are concerned. This was said not by countries that obviously want to attack Israel at every opportunity, but by people, I think, of good will and by representatives of countries of good will, who had that assessment as a fair difference of opinion with us. We argued at the time that we thought that this problem, the problem of international peace and security—that is, the problem of preventing attacks against Israel—is a problem of how to prevent terrorist attacks, which are continuously launched, from penetrating the southern cordon, given that there is no strong central Government in Lebanon.

64. The arrangements that we discussed proved to be successful, contrary to the expectations of many in this chamber. The attacks and the attempts were there—they are there all the time—but the successful attacks have, in fact, been very, very few. In fact, in the year since Israel withdrew from Lebanon we have had 12 car-bomb attacks—none of them has been successful—but the curve of attacks, even of attempts, rather than increasing, has been sharply declining. That reality—the fact that the south of Lebanon is its most traquil part and that there is relative calm there—is indeed reflected in the relevant passage in the Secretary-General's report.

65. Thus, the root question that faces us is the structural problem of Lebanon, and its domination, and the absence of a strong central Government which could police that area. UNIFIL cannot police that area, just as it cannot do what at least one representative here has called for, that is police the domestic strife in Jazzin and elsewhere. Great tragedies are occurring there and might occur there. But if UNIFIL wants to direct itself simply to the question of bloodshed, then it has many, many other areas to deal with in Lebanon where the needs are far greater and more pressing.

66. In short, the problem is not sovereignty; the problem is security. The problem is not even bloodshed; it belongs elsewhere. As far as UNIFIL is concerned, because it is not able structurally to stop terrorism, because it can only serve as a buffer between two Governments and because there is no sufficiently strong Government on one side, it is structurally unable to fulfil the mandate—or at least it is very, very difficult for it to fulfil the mandate as long as that reality prevails.

67. Therefore, our position on UNIFIL is that we do not think it has a useful role. We are not going to raise any objection, and I do not raise one here, with respect to the Council's decision, but we think that the reality is such that the only possibility for maintaining security in that area is the present situation as it exists.

68. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-61439—March 1995—1,925